

**The North Beach Area State Parks  
Stage Two  
Comments From Public Correspondence**

June 15, 2009

In stage one the community and customers helped us identify issues and concerns related to the state parks. During stage two, the planning team offers an [alternative report](#). The report suggests alternative approaches to address the issues and concerns identified in stage one. No preferred alternative is established; rather this is an opportunity to understand the range of possibilities.

These comments are from correspondence received as of this date. Verbatim comments are in column one. Column two lists the related issue and page number in the alternatives report.

If you feel that your comment was misunderstood, please send a follow-up correspondence or call.

Brian Hovis, Parks Planner  
Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission  
P.O. Box 42650  
Olympia, WA 98504-2650  
Phone: (360) 902-8635  
FAX: (360) 902-8666  
TDD (360) 664-3133  
E-mail: [brian.hovis@parks.wa.gov](mailto:brian.hovis@parks.wa.gov)

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>I concur with [REDACTED] comments provided yesterday and would like to add:</p> <p>Keep “Recreational” areas of high intensity use minimized</p> <p>Balance conservation/preservation areas with “Resource recreation” areas of medium/low intensity use</p> <p>Keep recreational “improvements” to minimum so maintenance/cost is minimized</p> <p>Be very transparent and up front with private landowners within the future potential park boundary</p> <p>Let market forces determine campground availability, not state parks/taxpayer money</p> <p>Use limited parking areas to limit use in areas intended for medium/low intensity use</p> <p>In alignment with 3 above, create low maintenance trails through park/new purchases</p> <p>Instead of developing a “full-service” G-P camping area, work toward private-public partnerships outside of park boundaries, and possibly provide funding for improved private camping near park, or some subsidies for lower cost private camping outside the park..</p> <p>Don’t build more infrastructure that requires more taxpayer \$ to just let it fall into ruin...on the flip-side of this, if you do build full service, provide dedicated long-term funding for Operations and Maintenance</p> <p>A Copalis river boat launch is a great idea. Does it have to be limited to human power only?...not critical...just a question</p> <p>Highway pull-outs are good!</p> <p>Improved and maintained bathrooms, in appropriate locations, are always good!</p> <p>Improvements to OBA points....careful here...not too much improvement...don’t want buildings and signs everywhere.</p> <p>Overall, to a large degree, let people experience nature....not a concrete infested series of campgrounds, parking lots, gift shops, and lights. Human “Improvements” are not necessarily better than nature, even when people ask for them!!!</p>	<p>Protection of natural plant and animal communities (p. 17, 20, 23, and 25)</p> <p>Future development (p. 18, 21, 24) and as a general statement about development.</p> <p>Human-powered boat launch (p.22)</p> <p>Highway pull-out (p. 22)</p> <p>Improvements to existing Ocean Beach Access (OBA) sites (p. 26)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>My wife and I were in attendance at the parks planning meeting at the Shilo last night and wanted to thank you for conducting a fine meeting [REDACTED]</p> <p>We think the process is a productive one and have enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity for providing input, which can be much more informed because of the information shared by you and other staff present.</p> <p>We look forward to the next round and the recommendations.</p>	Comment on process (p. 6)
<p>I've heard talk of adding Yurts to the park at Pacific Beach. I'm all for that. I think the idea is a very cool one. Low impact. (footprint) They can always be easily removed if it just couldn't work. I love it. Do it.</p>	Future development (p. 24)

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>First, I wish to make a few comments about the meeting, and then state my wishes for Parks...</p> <p>I thought you did a great job running the meeting. [REDACTED] My wishes for Parks are the following:</p> <p>Funding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please reinstate the day use fee at all park locations.</li> <li>2. I agree with the "opt out" for license renewal, and include an option for a larger donation.</li> <li>3. Bill the City of Ocean Shores for maintenance and upkeep of the restroom by the Shilo Inn, or give the facility to the city.</li> <li>4. Bill the County for maintenance and upkeep of the restroom at Ocean City, or give the facility to the County.</li> <li>5. Let go of Damon Point, and invite DNR along with Ocean Shores to oversee it.</li> </ol> <p>Ghost Forest:</p> <p>This could be advertised and promoted as the National Treasure that it is. It would generate incredible revenue for the area, and a human powered boat launch on Griffith Priday would provide access. Parks could rent canoes or kayaks, or allow an outside vendor to do it for a fee. I also see other spin off retailers springing up around the park and boat launch for meals and supplies.</p> <p>Continued efforts to purchase the Ghost Forest is critical for its preservation!</p> <p>Ocean City:</p> <p>I like the idea of expanding the park to include the 36 acres which is mostly wet lands that abuts Hogans Corner and across hwy 115. This is a great natural resource that is abundant with wild life and could be developed with trails and other minimal intrusion for a lasting gift to our community.</p> <p>Beach driving:</p> <p>Please investigate how Oregon has dealt with this issue. I do not see a valid reason for beach driving! The dangers and impact far outweigh any argument to allow vehicles on the beach!</p> <p>Thanks again, Brian, for a great meeting. I appreciate the efforts that You and Your staff have gone to, to allow the local community to have input.</p>	<p>Park fees (new issue)</p> <p>Improvements to existing Ocean Beach Access (OBA) sites (p. 26)</p> <p>Continuing public access to Damon Point (p. 15)</p> <p>Future recreational development (p. 21)</p> <p>Protection of natural plant and animal communities (p. 20)</p> <p>Protection of natural plant and animal communities (p. 17)</p> <p>Update of the North Beach Recreational Management Plan for the ocean beaches (p. 27)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p data-bbox="117 261 512 293">To Brian Hovis, Parks Planner</p> <p data-bbox="117 334 1289 440">We are again voicing our concern over House Bill 1083 allowing a pilot project for mineral prospecting on coastal areas. We feel this is not an appropriate use of our public beaches and is counter to the public interest.</p> <p data-bbox="117 480 1289 764">You have been holding workshops asking for public input about the North Beach Parks but there is no mention of the pilot project. Nor has there been official notification of this project made to the adjacent neighborhoods or the general public who live and recreate on the north beaches. Those who have learned of it through word-of-mouth are greatly alarmed by the prospect, especially the possible negative impacts to the razor clams. Why has there been no public discussion of this? When will the public have an opportunity to voice their concerns?</p> <p data-bbox="117 805 1289 992">The project is scheduled to conclude in July, 2009. Does Parks have enough staff to study the impacts or evaluate the long-term implications of industrial uses of our beaches? Is this the best use of staff time when there are so many other issues facing the coastal environment? How does beach mining fit into the stated goals listed in your recent workshops? It does not appear to be compatible with those goals.</p> <p data-bbox="117 1032 1289 1130">We urge you to assure that beach mining does not continue after the conclusion of the pilot project. Our coastal environment is continually threatened and should not be further violated by invasive activities.</p>	<p data-bbox="1323 261 1598 293">Beach mining (p. 25)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>Attn: Brian Hovis</p> <p>We have been WA State residents for 50 years.</p> <p>We enjoy the State Parks, and in particular the North Beach State Parks.</p> <p>We are currently traveling in the South West: CA, AZ, NM, &amp; UT. Their State Parks are every bit as nice as the WA Parks. Well maintained, and 1/2 the price. NM for example is \$14.00 with water, power, and a dump station.</p> <p>We are paying a very high rate in property tax, and sales tax to the State of WA, and have for 50 years.</p> <p>We do not see why, when the State gets in a financial bind in overspending it's budget, why the first thing they want to cut is something that a lot of WA State residents use for recreation.</p> <p>We are totally against closing any State parks.</p> <p>We do appreciate the little bit that we get from the WA State Senior Citizen Off Season Pass. We do believe that the Senior citizens of WA State, in the past, have made it the great state that it is, and we hope that it continues to be a great State, with great parks.</p> <p>Please inform us about any future meetings. We hope to be home June 1, so we would like to attend any future meetings, and have a positive input on what the future of WA State parks is going to be in comparison to the rest of our sister States.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>Budget Reduction – Mothballing Ocean City State Park (p. 18)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p data-bbox="107 220 472 256">D.G. comments Page 1 of 2</p> <p data-bbox="107 272 1291 565">I would like to make the meeting in Ocean Shores, but I will be in a brief hiatus between camping trips on the 27th and will be unable to make it since I have to use the time to get ready for a two month trip to Europe in early June. However, I want to take this opportunity to highly commend you and the rest of the staff (if there are others involved) for the impressive job of documentation you have done. I have read through the summaries from the public workshop and the correspondence and it appears there are several distinct, predominant messages that evidence the wishes of the public. They include, but are not restricted to (in no particular order):</p> <ul data-bbox="163 581 1291 914" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous small projects/improvements for the various parks were suggested.</li> <li>• Parks should be expanded and/or more land should be put under Parks for public use.</li> <li>• There is a shortage of camping spaces in our current state parks, creating difficulty for families being able to schedule using them.</li> <li>• Keep the parks open because the people want them for both their recreational value and the value they create in the surrounding communities and because of the cost of returning them to park status after being put in a 'mothball' status.</li> <li>• Continue to allow the use of beaches for aircraft landings and for vehicles in designated areas where allowed.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="107 930 1291 1076">Finally, the context report you developed provided much valuable information and many details to be taken into consideration in order to proceed to future phases. In reflecting upon what has been said in the summaries, I think several things can be agreed upon and/or accepted at face value.</p> <ul data-bbox="163 1092 1291 1458" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First, I think that the comments and suggestions in the first two bullets above regarding park improvements, additions and expansions can be shelved for this year based on the current state of the economy. If the 'soothsayers' and 'wizards' prove themselves to be correct and the state of the economy (and the Parks department budget) begins improving toward the end of the year with more improvement coming next year, I think that is the time for these incidental issues can begin to be moved forward for improvement. Obviously, there are some low cost/no cost changes that can be made to show advances while waiting for a better economic environment to enhance our ability to improve the parks. For example (although there are certainly others that could be identified), it is possible that the number of camping spaces (bullet # 3) could be increased thus reducing the over-demand for existing spaces, but those created should be without utilities for 'dry camping'. Volunteers could be used for site preparation, making firepits and picnic tables, and for increasing 'host' presence.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1312 256 1774 297">General comment on process (p. 6)</p> <p data-bbox="1312 589 1795 703">Summary of comments contained in:  <a href="#">Stage one issues from correspondence</a></p> <p data-bbox="1312 735 1690 816"> <a href="#">Stage one issues from public workshop</a> </p> <p data-bbox="1312 1101 1774 1214">Future development (p. 18, 21, 24) and as a general statement about development.</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p data-bbox="117 224 474 256">D.G. comments Page 2 of 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="163 310 1293 597">• The 'biggie', bullet # 4, is keeping the current parks open, keeping them open, keeping them open because it is something that, among the participants and correspondents is a universal demand. It's good for the people of the state to be able to have the facilities to use if they so avail themselves, it is good for the surrounding communities from both an economic sense and and the environment it creates and enhances, and it is good for the State of Washington because it is visible evidence that the state is progressive, cares for its people, is in tune with the environment, and is a good place in which to invest and live.</li> <li data-bbox="163 630 1293 1430">• Finally (bullet #5), I tend to think that we need to retain the rights of pilots to land on the beach at Copalis. They are an unusually small part of the public, but they deserve the ability to have their 'place at the table' as much as any other minority group. I flew in the military and still have a pilot's license, but do not fly now primarily because I do not find flying as exciting as it was in the service. Still, it is important to retain something unique that other states do not have because they have failed to act as stewards of their resources. And is safety really an important issue that is being compromised? Not if those participating in the event accept their own risks as they do with other aspects of the flying process and not if the public keeps in mind that their actions...like ignoring signs, not being mindful of what the area is also used for, and allowing their children to wander around completely oblivious to their surroundings and uncontrolled...require attention being paid to what is going on around them. Those that worry about the safety aspects can and should avoid the area because it is a matter of individual choice. However, perhaps they should avoid coming to the oceanside as well because of the much higher risk and danger associated with being in and around places where there is water. And those with environmental concerns of the area possibly being polluted if an accident should occur should maybe pay more attention to statistics and should concern themselves with other, greater, and more probable environmental pollution issues. (The same goes with those that complain about people driving on the beaches creates safety or environmental hazards. They need to do the math and pay more attention to issues in which their improvements will actually improve things and net a bigger payoff.)</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1323 297 1745 367">Budget Reduction – Mothballing Ocean City State Park (p. 18)</p> <p data-bbox="1323 626 1619 659">Copalis Airport (p. 26)</p>



North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>After reading documents you referred to, I would like to suggest more access for biking such as the paving of the old railroad tracks nearby to afford exercise and enjoyment of the beaches further north. Area to ride is very limited by the narrow shoulders and traffic on the two highways in and out of Pacific Beach.</p>	<p>New issue (Non-motorized trails outside the state parks)</p>
<p>A pedestrian bridge would be great (we are wanting the same -- or similar -- bridge that is at Heath Road. It also seems that in an emergency an ambulance could drive across it, but it is designed for foot traffic only).</p> <p>We would like to be able to park at Griffiths-Priday (near the restrooms) and walk across the bridge to the beach.</p>	<p>Pedestrian bridge at Benner Road (p. 21)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>My response to your inquiry requesting comments on North Beach State Parks is the same as my response of 3/9/09.</p> <p>My family and I have camped at Ocean City State Park for the past 5 summers. For the most part we have found the campground to be in good to fair condition, but, over the years have found the condition of the campsites to be deteriorating. The campground layout itself is great. We would book about 4-5 spaces together in Loop #4, (the utility loop), for a yearly family reunion the second weekend in August of each year.</p> <p>What needs improvement is the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More sites with full hook-ups, (power, water, sewer)</li><li>Power at 30 amps is still workable, (being next to the cool ocean air)</li><li>Current utility post could use updating</li><li>Campground access roads and campsite pads need to be repaved</li><li>Level out campsite pad paved area as much as possible</li><li>Build-up tent areas in each campsite so they are higher than the surrounding area to keep tent floors from getting wet</li><li>Re-seed the grass areas to cut down on the amount of dirt, (mud)</li><li>Put in recycle containers</li></ul>	<p>Future development (p. 18)</p>

North Beach area state parks – Verbatim Comments	Main Issue
<p>We would like to re-state our previous comment -- we would love to see a study one car bridge installed at Griffiths-Priday state park. A bridge would once again make the beach at Griffiths-Priday "user friendly" and more importantly A BRIDGE WOULD ALLOW EMERGENCY VEHICLES ACCESS TO THE BEACH AT GRIFFITHS-PRIDAY STATE PARK.</p> <p>Thanks for keeping us informed.</p> <p>[Follow-up]</p> <p>We are talking about a bridge similar to the one at Heath Road at Benner Road (the road adjacent to Griffiths-Priday State Park).</p> <p>Thanks for listening!</p>	<p>Pedestrian bridge at Benner Road (p. 21)</p>
<p>Hi Brian, sorry I didn't get back to you sooner but this got "lost" in all my e-mail! I am sure there will be issues with snowy plover use of some of the parks in the North Beach area and I would recommend contacting [REDACTED] of our Western Washington Fish and Wildlife Office. From our National Wildlife Refuge perspective, particularly as it relates to Copalis National Wildlife Refuge, I would like to be kept informed as the planning process progresses. There are issues with aircraft landings and takeoffs near the Pacific Beach Park with the potential disturbance to wildlife and safety to beach users. I know this is a complicated issue as the beach is managed as an "airport" by Washington Dept of Transportation but am sure is an issue that will surface during public scoping. In addition to disturbance of refuge wildlife by aircraft there is potential for disturbance by beach users trespassing onto refuge rocks adjacent to the park.</p>	<p>Recover of Western Snowy Plover (p. 14)</p> <p>Copalis Airport (p. 26)</p>

**Longer correspondence follows.**



May 26, 2009

**TO:** Brian Hovis, Parks Planner  
Washington State Parks and Recreation

**FROM:** Kathy Greer, Washington Pacific Coast Coordinator  
Surfrider Foundation  
[kgreer@surfrider.org](mailto:kgreer@surfrider.org)

**SUBJECT:** North Beach Parks Comments for Public Meeting on May 27, 2009

Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment on the North Beach State Parks land use plans for Ocean City, Pacific Beach, Griffiths-Friday and Damon Point state parks and the Seashore Conservation Area in Grays Harbor County which will lead to your planning team's recommendations for both land classifications and long-term boundaries for the state parks.

Surfrider Foundation appreciates your commitment to conservation and protection and preservation of our state parks and their habitat areas that support wildlife and recreational opportunities for coastal Grays Harbor.

On behalf of the Surfrider Foundation I would like to submit the following points to be taken into account for the next public workshop to be held May 27, 2009 in Ocean Shores, Washington. The Surfrider Foundation is a non-profit organization dedicated to the protection and enjoyment of our world's oceans, waves and beaches. Founded in 1984 by a handful of ocean enthusiasts, the Surfrider Foundation now maintains over 50,000 members and 80 chapters worldwide, including five in Washington State including the South Coast Chapter in Grays Harbor County. We are working in coastal Grays Harbor to protect access to quality recreational opportunities and to engage coastal communities and recreational users in the stewardship of our coast. Because of our vested interest in the long-term health of Pacific Coast beaches and marine waters, we request that you incorporate the following into the recommendations for the North Beach State Parks land use plans.

The items below in italics were taken from the North Beach Area State Parks CAMP document. Surfrider would like to emphasize these items as ones of major consideration and/or concern in drafting the parks land use plan. It appears that there are three major "at risk" categories in your jurisdiction which include (as noted below): 1) water quality 2) species risk (fish, animal, and plant species) 3) and to some extent erosion. Also it is quite apparent by the "Community Factors Contribution" section that a significant amount of revenue is contributed to both the state parks and local businesses from recreational use.

**With this in mind our recommendation is two-fold: 1) to assist in the improvement of local economies by offering accessible, quality park facilities and 2) to protect, preserve, and revitalize wildlife and habitat in these areas through the use of ecosystem based management and sound science; including if necessary extending park boundaries to further improve conservation opportunities.**

Thank you for consideration of our recommendations. If you have any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact me at 360-581-7060 or [kgreer@surfrider.org](mailto:kgreer@surfrider.org).

**Community factors Contribution to local economies:** *The total amount of annual taxes (sales tax, local tax, Hotel/Motel tax) contributed by Ocean City and Pacific Beach state parks to the Department of Revenue and local governments was \$95,300.*

*Based on only overnight visitors<sup>3</sup>, the estimated contribution to the local economy of Grays Harbor County is \$3.7 million between 2002 and 2008. On average the state parks contribute \$530 thousand per year to the local economy.*

**Natural Factors**

## Surfrider Foundation 2 of 3

*Plants and Animals: Endangered and threatened species, critical habitat, candidate species and species of concern known to occur in Grays Harbor County<sup>4</sup>, and may be present in the state parks and Seashore Conservation Area include:*

### Listed

*Brown pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis) [outer coast] Bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus) Marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus) Northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina) Oregon silverspot butterfly (Speyeria zerene hippolyta) Short-tailed albatross (Phoebastria albatrus) [outer coast] Western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus)*

### Designated

*Critical habitat for bull trout Critical habitat for the marbled murrelet Critical habitat for the northern spotted owl Critical habitat for the western snowy plover*

### Candidate

*Streaked horned lark (Eremophila alpestris strigata) Yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus)*

### Species of concern

*Aleutian Canada goose (Branta canadensis leucopareia) Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) Cascades frog (Rana cascadae) Coastal cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarki clarki) [southwest Washington DPS] Columbia torrent salamander (Rhyacotriton kezeri) Long-eared myotis (Myotis evotis) Long-legged myotis (Myotis volans) Makahs copper (butterfly) (Lycaena mariposa charlottensis) Newcombs littorine snail (Algamorda newcombiana) Northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis) Northern sea otter (Enhydra lutris kenyoni) Olive-sided flycatcher (Contopus cooperi) Olympic torrent salamander (Rhyacotriton olympicus) Pacific lamprey (Lampetra tridentata) Pacific Townsends big-eared bat (Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii) Peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus) River lamprey (Lampetra ayresi) Tailed frog (Ascaphus truei) Tufted puffin (Fratercula cirrhata) Van Dykes salamander (Plethodon vandykei) Western gray squirrel (Sciurus griseus griseus) Western toad (Bufo boreas) White-top aster (Aster curtus) Tall bugbane (Cimicifuga elata) Frigid shootingstar (Dodecatheon austrofrigidum) Footsteps of spring; bear's-foot sanicle (Sanicula arctopoides)*

## Ocean City State Park

*Plants: A plant association survey has been completed<sup>8</sup>. Floating marsh pennyworth (Hydrocotyle ranunculoides) is present in the park and was previously listed as sensitive in the Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program rare plant list.*

## Pacific Beach

*Water quality: The Department of Ecology website does not list any "Impaired and Threatened Surface Waters" on the park property. Joe Creek is not listed, but is considered a water body about which there are concerns with water quality.*  
**Griffiths-Friday State Park**

*Water: The park is adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and Copalis River. There are 90 acres of potential wetlands on the property.*

## Damon Point

*Water quality: The Department of Ecology website does not list any "Impaired and Threatened Surface Waters". Parts of Grays Harbor near the north end of Protection Island are not listed, but are considered a water body where there are concerns about water quality. The Spartina infestation identified in the Department of Ecology database probably does not exist any longer because of coastal erosion.*

*Water: Park property is near, but not adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. There are 28 acres of potential wetlands identified.*

*Animals: The Priority and Habitat Species database lists nests for streaked horned larks, a candidate species for Endangered and Threatened Species listing<sup>12</sup>. Snowy plover nests were also listed on the database. Please note many of these nest sites may have been lost because of beach erosion. The Priority and Habitat Species database lists the following priority habitats within the park, including:*

## Surfrider Foundation 3 of 3

*Coastal Salt Marshes Meadows and Brackish Marshes.  
Snowy Plover Breeding Area (an endangered species)  
Shorebird Concentrations*

*Structures and facilities:*

<i>One vault toilet (removed and set aside for future use)</i>	<i>10-car parking area (destroyed by beach erosion)</i>	<i>One RV parking stall (destroyed by beach erosion)</i>
<i>One interpretive station (removed due to beach erosion)</i>	<i>Remaining segments of the former 1.2 mile public roadway. (most removed)</i>	

### **Seashore Conservation Area**

*Water quality: The Department of Ecology website does list “Impaired and Threatened Surface Waters”, because of fecal coliform near the Moclips Ocean Beach Access. There are several other areas where a water body is not listed, but where water quality concerns exist.*

## From The Nature Conservancy

Dear Mr. Hovis:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternative emphases for the North Beach parks complex on the Washington coast. We have the following general comments and may have additional specific comments related to the Griffith-Priddy Ocean State Park.

On p. 12, State Parks, under the "Recreational Resources" heading includes a bullet that states: "Increase trails within the state parks." While this statement may be applicable to some of the state parks in the complex, it need not necessarily apply to all. For instance, it may be difficult to expand trail opportunities at Damon Point without adversely impacting snowy plovers. Parks may want to make a less categorical statement related to trail expansion at *all* the North Beach parks.

On the same page (12), under the "Natural Resources" rubric, we recommend consideration of the following:

Expand park boundaries, where appropriate, to incorporate broader ecosystem function, especially of wetland channels and riparian corridors with adjacent uplands.

Finally, under "Partnership" (p. 12), Parks may wish to add:

Cooperate with local and state NGO's to accomplish park objectives in acquiring and stewarding high quality examples of ecosystems of statewide significance.

### ***Damon Point:***

We commend Parks for working cooperatively with the Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to stabilize and recover the *snowy plover*. So long as State Parks implements the management plan mutually agreed upon by all three agencies, we support the process. We would appreciate it if Parks would detail in a sentence or two how enforcement of the snowy plover nesting closure is implemented and which of the agencies has primary responsibility for such enforcement.

Page 2.

### ***Ocean City State Park:***

1. We support the larger expanded park as depicted in the Natural Alternative.
2. We also request that Parks consider the possibility of designating the expansion areas as "Natural" rather than "Resource Recreation." This may be more in keeping with their important values for nesting and migratory avifauna.

### ***Griffith-Priddy State Park:***

1. The Pacific Northwest Coast Ecoregional Assessment, a multi-agency approved document, designates the Copalis River watershed as a Portfolio Site because of its important ecological values. We encourage Parks staff to familiarize themselves with this document and to use the natural resource information that it contains in the preparation of the Phase III document for the North Beach Parks.
2. Because of the above, we support the more expansive of the two boundary alternatives found in the "Natural" emphasis.
3. We also support the Natural Area designation for both the existing park land, coded on the map, and the proposed Natural Area land that may be acquired within the proposed expanded boundary ("Natural" emphasis alternative).
4. Finally, we applaud State Parks for planning for the future at Griffith-Priddy. The "Natural" emphasis expansion area would make a meaningful addition to the State's protected areas.

## The Nature Conservancy 2 of 2

We would appreciate being informed of future developments related to Phase III planning for the North Beach park complex. We are especially interested in the potential expansion of the Griffith-Priddy State Park complex along the Copalis River and the protection of the nesting snowy plovers at Damon Point.

After June 30, 2009, information should be addressed to the following individuals at The Nature Conservancy:



Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above parks.

Sincerely,

Fayette F. Krause  
Washington Land Steward